

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

ROBERT BRUCE, BRYAN SLATON,  
AND GRAYSON COUNTY  
CONSERVATIVES PAC,

*Plaintiffs,*

V.

J.R. JOHNSON, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE TEXAS ETHICS COMMISSION; MARY K. KENNEDY; RANDALL H. ERBEN; CHAD M. CRAYCRAFT; CHRIS FLOOD; PATRICK W. MIZELL; RICHARD S. SCHMIDT; JOSEPH O. SLOVACEK; AND STEVEN D. WOLENS, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITIES AS MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS ETHICS COMMISSION,

*Defendants.*

55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:22-cv-1166

**ANSWER IN INTERVENTION OF THE  
HON. CHARLIE GEREN AND THE HON. DUSTIN BURROWS**

The Honorable Charlie Geren and the Honorable Dustin Burrows (“Intervenors”), as their Answer in Intervention, state the following:

## I. RESPONSES TO ALLEGATIONS

1. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 1 of Plaintiff's Original Complaint.

2. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

3. Intervenor's admit the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 3 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint but deny the allegations in the second section of that paragraph.

4. Intervenor's admit Plaintiffs seek the relief described in paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint, but otherwise deny the allegations of this paragraph.

5. Intervenor's deny the allegations of paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

6. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

7. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

8. Intervenor's lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

9. Intervenor's admit that Plaintiff Brian Slaton is a member of the Texas House of Representatives but otherwise lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

10. Intervenor's admit the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint but otherwise lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in that paragraph.

11. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

12. Intervenor's deny Plaintiffs' characterization of the office of Speaker of the House in the first sentence of paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint but admit the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

13. Intervenor's admit that the quotation from the decision in *Reisman* is accurate but otherwise deny the allegations of paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

14. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

15. Intervenor's lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

16. Intervenor's lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

17. Intervenor's lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

18. Intervenor's lack sufficient information to admit or deny the truth of the allegations in paragraph 18 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

19. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 19 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

20. Intervenor's admit the allegations in paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

21. Intervenors admit the statute to which paragraph 21 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint refers is quoted accurately but otherwise deny the allegations of this paragraph.

22. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

23. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 23 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

24. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 24 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

25. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 25 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

26. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 26 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

27. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 27 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

28. Intervenors admit the allegations in paragraph 28 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

29. In answer to paragraph 29 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint, Intervenors incorporate herein by reference as if set forth verbatim the preceding paragraphs of this pleading.

30. The allegations in paragraph 30 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint are statements of law, not fact, and do not require admission or denial.

31. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 31 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

32. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 32 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

33. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 33 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

34. In answer to paragraph 34 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint, Intervenor incorporate herein by reference as if set forth verbatim the preceding paragraphs of this pleading.

35. The allegations in paragraph 35 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint are statements of law, not fact, and do not require admission or denial.

36. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 36 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

37. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 37 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

38. Intervenor deny the allegations in paragraph 38 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint.

39. The allegations in paragraph 39 of Plaintiffs' Original Complaint do not require admission or denial.

## II. INTERVENORS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSIVE ALLEGATIONS

### A. Legislative Immunity.

The election of the Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives is a legislative act carried out by a vote on the floor of the House. The rules governing that vote and campaigns to influence it were promulgated by the Legislature as part of its internal processes and are an integral part of the communicative and deliberative processes of the House. Further, the floor vote on a Speaker nominee constitutes “legislation” as defined by Texas law. Legislative immunity therefore applies. *See, e.g., Nat’l Ass’n of Soc. Workers v. Harwood*, 69 F.3d 622 (1st Cir. 1995); *Empower Texans, Inc. v. Geren*, 388 F. Supp. 3d 738, 747 (W.D. Tex. 2019). This Court therefore should not rewrite the Legislature’s rules.

### B. Lobbying Laws.

Because the election of the House Speaker is a legislative act, the effort to allow influencing the outcome through unlimited spending of political contributions by politicians and political committees implicates the lobbying laws enacted by the Legislature. Those laws regulate—constitutionally—efforts to influence legislative acts like the floor vote on the election of a Speaker of the House.

Lobbying is governed by Chapter 305 of the Texas Government Code. Section 305.003 requires persons to register as lobbyists if they spend more than a prescribed amount to communicate with legislators about legislation or are paid for doing so. TEX. GOV’T CODE §§ 305.003(a)(1) and 305.003(a)(2). The definition of “legislation” is broad, encompassing “any matter that is or may be the subject of action by either

house or by a legislative committee, including the introduction, consideration, passage, defeat, approval, or veto of the matter.” TEX. GOV’T CODE § 305.002(6)(B). The vote on the nomination of a Speaker thus constitutes legislation.

The relief Plaintiffs seek—the ability to use unlimited amounts of political contributions and other funds receive to influence the House’s choice of its Speaker—ignores these laws. Plaintiffs effectively seek to be lobbyists without limits and without satisfying the registration and disclosure requirements governing lobbying.

In addition, Texas law prohibits the use of political contributions to fund lobbying activities, in part to ensure that money contributed to support a candidate’s election or to defray officeholder expenses is not converted to another use the contributor never considered. A person required to register as a lobbyist cannot use funds received as political contributions to make political contributions, political expenditures, or direct campaign expenditures. TEX. ELECTION CODE § 253.006. Yet that is the very thing Plaintiffs seek to achieve. Unless all these laws are to be held invalid, Plaintiffs cannot have the relief they seek.

The lobbying laws serve a compelling state interest—preventing corruption and the appearance of corruption. Because the relief Plaintiffs seek would gut these laws as to the selection of the Speaker of the House, that relief should be denied.

### **C. The Speaker election statutes are constitutional.**

The statutes governing the process of naming a House Speaker are constitutional. Those statutes properly are viewed as regulating efforts to influence a legislative act by 150 House members—an “aye” or “nay” vote on a nomination—

not an election in the ordinary sense of the word. Given the small “electorate,” the statutory scheme set out in the Government Code and the Election Code regarding use of money to influence legislative acts, and the prospects of undue influence and corruption raised by unlimited use of political funds to affect the choice of a Speaker, Texas’s laws serve a compelling state interest and are tailored to that end.

Those laws should not be cast aside so that well-funded political actors can use unlimited political contributions to politicians and political committees to influence the process. A state plainly has the right to regulate the expenditure of money on lobbying the Legislature. A candidate or officeholder has no constitutional right to use funds received as political contributions to lobby the Legislature—something Texas law expressly prohibits. A political action committee similarly has no constitutional right to use contributions to it for lobbying the Legislature, whether on the question of a Speaker nomination or otherwise.

### **III. PRAYER**

For the reasons stated above, the relief Plaintiffs seek should be denied.



Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jonathan D. Pauerstein

Jonathan D. Pauerstein

State Bar No. 15637500

Lauren C. Howell

State Bar No. 24125286

ROSENTHAL PAUERSTEIN

SANDOLOSKI AGATHER LLP

755 E. Mulberry, Suite 200

San Antonio, Texas 78212

Telephone: (210) 225-5000

Facsimile: (210) 354-4034

jpauerstein@rpsalaw.com

lhowell@rpsalaw.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS  
HON. CHARLIE GEREN AND  
HON. DUSTIN BURROWS**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this the \_\_\_\_ day of December, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the following counsel of record in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure:

William Garrett McMillan, III  
Tony Keith McDonald  
The Law Offices of Tony McDonald  
1501 Leander Dr.  
Bldg B, Suite 2  
Leander, TX 78641  
garrett@tonymcdonald.com  
tony@tonymcdonald.com

James Tinley  
General Counsel  
Texas Ethics Commission  
201 East 14<sup>th</sup> St., 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Austin, Texas 78701  
James.tinley@ethics.state.tx.us

**Attorneys for Plaintiffs**

Christopher D. Hilton  
Office of the Attorney General of Texas  
P O Box 12548  
Capital Station  
Austin, TX 78701  
christopher.hilton@oag.texas.gov

**Attorney for Defendants**

/s/ Jonathan D. Pauerstein  
Jonathan D. Pauerstein